arXiv:1401.6044v3 [math.ST] 20 Jun 2014

A Recursive Two-Sided Change Detection Algorithm

James Falt and Steven D. Blostein

Abstract

The problem of detecting an abrupt change in a sequence of independent and identically distributed (IID) random variables is addressed. Sequentially received samples are IID both before and after a single unknown change time. Unlike previous approaches to change detection that assume a known probability density function (PDF) at the start, the problem here is to detect a change between two given PDFs in either direction, meaning that the number of hypotheses to be tracked is always twice the number of samples received. A Bayesian multiple hypothesis approach is proposed and shown to have the following properties: (i) unlike previous tests that require a threshold, the minimum cost hypothesis is tracked through time, (ii) under an exponential delay cost function and suitable parameter choices, the proposed procedure's probability of detecting a change in the incorrect direction asymptotically vanishes with time, (iii) the method is recursive with constant computation per unit time, and (iv) the probabilities of false alarm and incorrect detection may be directly traded off with average delay. Performance results using simulation confirm the derived properties and also reveal that the average delay, after a transient period corresponding to when the starting state is uncertain, approaches that of the optimal one-sided test, CUSUM.

I. Introduction

Let $X_1^n = \{X_i | i = 1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ be n independent random variables observed sequentially. Each of these random variables are known to follow one of two possible known distributions,

The authors are with Dept. of Electrical and Computer Eng., Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada. (email: steven.blostein@queensu.ca). This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Discovery Grant 41731.

which are described by probability density functions (PDF) f_0 and f_1. While observing X_1^n, the objective is to determine, as quickly as possible, whether a single change, either from f_0 tof_1, or from f_1 to f_0 has occurred at some unknown discrete time $m \in \mathcal{Z}+$ *without prior knowledge of the initial state, i.e., whether the PDF of* X_1 *is* f_0 *or* f_1.

An application of particular interest is cognitive radio, where f_0 may represent the PDF of an observed discrete-time signal in the unoccupied, or 'OFF' state of a communication channel, typically represented as zero-mean Gaussian background noise with variance σ_n^2, whereas f_1 represents the occupied, or 'ON' state of a channel, where the same background Gaussian noise is observed in addition to an unknown signal occupying the band. Here, the unknown signal is modelled stochastically as normally distributed with variance σ_s^2, and is thus detectable from the additional observed energy of each sample. In contrast to previous formulations, the *initial state* corresponding the PDF at the start of observation X_1 is unknown. In addition, it is assumed that conditioned on either f_0 or f_1, the samples are assumed to be independent.

Previously, in the case where the initial state is known, detection of a single change in distribution in an independent sequence of random variables has been well studied, including major developments that took place in [1], [2], [3], [4], as well as the substantial number of references that can be found in the recent book [5]. Recently, the problem of detecting multiple changes in sequences, termed *ON-OFF processes* has been addressed in [6], where the structure of an optimum test is found by formulating an optimization problem using partially observable Markov processes. However, similar to these previous approaches the initial state is assumed known. It has been observed previously that quickest detection performance is drastically affected if the assumed initial state is incorrect [7] [8]. Finally, as is the case throughout the literature, the general problem of threshold selection to guarantee an exact probability of false alarm for these above quickest detection methods is generally intractable.

In Section II, the two-sided change detection problem is formulated using Bayes decision theory. Section III derives recursive expressions for the Bayes risk, suitable for problems involving causal (on-line) observation. While design of the test threshold is also intractable here, a parameterization of the cost function is proposed and studied in Section IV. Results are described

in Section V which reinforce the insights provided in Section IV as well as make comparisons to CUSUM, which has been shown to be optimal for one-sided quickest detection [4] [5].

II. Sequential Two Sided Change Detection

At time n, without knowledge of the starting PDF (of X_1), a sequence of independent random variables, $X_1^n \equiv X_1, X_2, \cdots X_n$, may assume $2n$ possible joint distributions corresponding to all possible single abrupt changes in distribution from f_0 to f_1 and vice versa. Classically, for a fixed number of samples, the problem may be formulated in terms of M-ary hypothesis testing [9]. Two of these $2n$ sequences, corresponding to *no change*, are described by the sequence X_i^n where all $X_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ are distributed according to f_j, where $j \in \{0, 1\}$. The other $2(n-1)$ possible sequences are described by the sequence X_1^n where X_i, $1 \leq i < m$, are distributed according to f_j, and the rest of the X_i, $m \leq i \leq n$, are distributed according to f_k, where $\{j, k\} \in \{0, 1\}$ or $\{1, 0\}$. The notation adopted to represent the $2n$ possible sequences is given by:

$$H_1 = \{X_i \sim f_0 | 1 \leq i \leq n\} \tag{1}$$

$$\overline{H_1} = \{X_i \sim f_1 | 1 \leq i \leq n\} \tag{2}$$

$$H_j = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} X_i \sim f_0 | 1 \leq i < j \\ X_i \sim f_1 | j \leq i \leq n \end{array} \right\} \quad 2 \leq j \leq n \tag{3}$$

$$\overline{H_j} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} X_i \sim f_1 | 1 \leq i < j \\ X_i \sim f_0 | j \leq i \leq n \end{array} \right\} \quad 2 \leq j \leq n. \tag{4}$$

Suppose for now that n is fixed. To formulate a decision rule to select among the $2n$ possible hypotheses, we adopt a Bayesian framework based on selecting the hypothesis with minimum risk according to Bayesian $(2n)$-ary hypothesis testing. Under equally likely prior probabilities of change time, a traditional Bayesian hypothesis testing scheme minimizes the posterior risk associated with each of the $2n$ hypotheses. However, when an infinite-duration sequence is causally observed, the number of hypotheses grows with n, which results in increasing computational and memory resources. To alleviate this, a time-recursive version of Bayes risk computation testing is first formulated.

In a Bayesian formulation, the posterior probabilities of hypothesis H_j being true given $X_1^n = x_1^n$ for $1 < j < n$, which we denote as $P(H_j|X_1^n = x_1^n)$, as well as the posteriors for hypothesis $\overline{H_j}$, for $1 < j < n$ need to be tracked. Using Bayes' Rule,

$$P(H_j|X_1^n = x_1^n) \quad = \quad \frac{P(X_1^n = x_1^n|H_j)P(H_j)}{P(X_1^n = x_1^n)} \tag{5}$$

where $P(X_1^n = x_1^n|H_j)$ is the likelihood of observing $X_1^n = x_1^n$ given that H_j is true, $P(H_j)$ is the prior probability of H_j, and $P(X_1^n = x_1^n)$ is the joint probability of observing $X_1^n = x_1^n$ for the n samples received. From independence conditioned on H_j, the likelihood function

$$P(X_1^n = x_1^n|H_j) = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^n f_0(x_i) & \text{if } j = 1, \\ \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} f_0(x_i) \prod_{i=j}^n f_1(x_i) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

A similar expression can be written for $P(X_1^n = x_1^n|\overline{H_j}), 1 \leq j \leq n$. This Bayes formulation uses the following notation for costs and prior probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{kj} &\equiv \text{cost of choosing } H_k \text{ when } H_j \text{ is true} \\ L_{k\overline{j}} &\equiv \text{cost of choosing } H_k \text{ when } \overline{H_j} \text{ is true} \\ L_{\overline{k}j} &\equiv \text{cost of choosing } \overline{H_k} \text{ when } H_j \text{ is true} \\ L_{\overline{kj}} &\equiv \text{cost of choosing } \overline{H_k} \text{ when } \overline{H_j} \text{ is true} \\ \pi_j &\equiv \text{prior probability that } H_j \text{ is true} \\ \overline{\pi_j} &\equiv \text{prior probability that } \overline{H_j} \text{ is true.} \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity purposes, we assume symmetrical costs: $L_{kj} = L_{\overline{kj}}$ and $L_{k\overline{j}} = L_{\overline{k}j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$, $1 \leq k \leq n$. The conditional risk in choosing hypothesis $H_k,\ 1 \leq k \leq n$, given $X_1^n = x_1^n$,

$$R_k^n = \sum_{j=1}^n (\pi_j L_{kj} P(H_j|X_1^n = x_1^n) + \overline{\pi_j} L_{k\overline{j}} P(\overline{H_j}|X_1^n = x_1^n)), \tag{7}$$

and the conditional risk in choosing $\overline{H_k}$ given $X_1^n = x_1^n$,

$$R_{\overline{k}}^n = \sum_{j=1}^n \pi_j L_{\overline{k}j} P(H_j|X_1^n = x_1^n) + \overline{\pi_j} L_{\overline{kj}} P(\overline{H_j}|X_1^n = x_1^n). \tag{8}$$

It is desired, at every n, to determine the hypothesis with minimum risk, i.e.,

$$\text{argmin}_n \left\{ \quad R_1^n, \quad R_{\overline{1}}^n, \quad \min_{2 \leq k \leq n} R_k^n, \quad \min_{2 \leq k \leq n} R_{\overline{k}}^n \quad \right\}. \tag{9}$$

The following terminology will be adopted in the sequel: for n such that R_1^n (or $R_{\overline{1}}^n$) has minimum risk, there is *no detection* of a change. If H_k (or $\overline{H_k}$) has minimum risk, at some $n < m$, detection occurs too soon, i.e., a *false alarm* is declared. On the other hand, if $n > m$ there is *detection delay*. If $\overline{H_k}$, for $2 \leq k \leq n$ becomes the least risk hypothesis, and H_j is true, $2 \leq j \leq n$, or vice-versa, an *incorrect detection* is said to occur at time n.

III. Proposed Bayes Cost Structure

We assume equally likely a priori hypotheses and omit constant factor $1/2n$ affecting all hypotheses equally. From (7) we have

$$R_1^n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (L_{1j} P(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n) + L_{1\overline{j}} P(\overline{H_j} | X_1^n = x_1^n)). \tag{10}$$

Next, we adopt a specific cost structure to account for delay, incorrect detection and false alarm so that the risks may be meaningfully compared across time. Exponentially increasing costs in choosing H_1 when H_j or $\overline{H_j}, j = 1, 2, \ldots n$ is true are assumed:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{1j} &\equiv \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j = 1 \\ a^{n-j+1} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ L_{1\overline{j}} &\equiv \begin{cases} c^n & \text{if } j = 1 \\ c^{j-1} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $a > 1$ denotes unit cost of delay and $c > 1$ denotes unit cost of incorrect detection. Based on these costs, it can be shown that (10) can be computed recursively.

$$\begin{aligned} R_1^n = & \overbrace{\sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(a^{n-j+1} P(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n) \right)}^{R_1^n[1]} \\ & + \overbrace{\sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(c^{j-1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^n = x_1^n) \right)}^{R_1^n[2]} \\ & + \underbrace{c^n P(H_{\overline{1}} | X_1^n = x_1^n).}_{R_1^n[3]} \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_1^n[1] &= \sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(a^{n-j+1} P(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n)\right), \\ R_1^n[2] &= \sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(c^{j-1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^n = x_1^n)\right), \\ R_1^n[3] &= c^n P(H_{\overline{1}} | X_1^n = x_1^n). \end{aligned}$$

where the first term can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned} R_1^{n+1}[1] &= \sum_{j=2}^{n+1} \left(a^{(n+1)-j+1} P(H_j | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1})\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(a^{(n+1)-j+1} P(H_j | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1})\right) + aP(H_{n+1} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\ &= \left[\sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(a^{n-j+1} P(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n)\right)\right] af_1(x_{n+1}) + aP(H_{n+1} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\ &= R_1^n[1] af_1(x_{n+1}) + aP(H_{n+1} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}), \end{aligned}$$

$R_1^n[2]$ can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned} R_1^{n+1}[2] &= \sum_{j=2}^{n+1} \left(c^{j-1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1})\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(c^{j-1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1})\right) + c^n P(H_{\overline{n+1}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\ &= \sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(c^{j-1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^n = x_1^n)\right) f_0(x_{n+1}) + c^n P(H_{\overline{n+1}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\ &= R_1^n[2] f_0(x_{n+1}) + c^n P(H_{\overline{n+1}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

and $R_1^n[3]$ can be updated recursively as

$$\begin{aligned} R_1^{n+1}[3] &= c^{n+1} P(H_{\overline{1}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\ &= \left(c^n P(H_{\overline{1}} | X_1^n = x_1^n)\right) cf_1(x_{n+1}) \\ &= R_1^n[3] cf_1(x_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Showing that the minimum risk R_k^n can be tracked recursively is more involved, as the minimum risk change time k may differ over time. Let k represent the minimum risk change time at time

n and let k' be the minimum risk change time corresponding to time $n-1$. The minimum risk corresponding to change time k is then updated at time n as

$$R_k^n = \min\{\ R_n^n,\ R_{k'}^n\ \}, \tag{13}$$

where from (7) under equal priors,

$$R_n^n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(L_{nj} P(H_j | X_1^n = x_i^n) + L_{n\bar{j}} P(\overline{H_j} | X_1^n = x_1^n) \right) \tag{14}$$

and the costs of choosing H_n given H_j or $\overline{H_j}$, respectively, are

$$\begin{aligned} L_{nj} &\equiv \begin{cases} b & \text{if } j = 1 \\ a^{n-j} & \text{if } 1 < j < n \\ 0 & \text{if } j = n. \end{cases} \\ L_{n\bar{j}} &\equiv \begin{cases} c^{n-1} & \text{if } j = 1 \\ a^{j-1} c & \text{if } 1 < j \leq n, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where a and c are as defined before, and b is defined as the cost of false alarm. Using (15),

$$\begin{aligned} R_n^n = & \overbrace{bP(H_1 | X_1^n = x_1^n)}^{R_n^n[1]} + \overbrace{\sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \left(a^{n-j} P(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n) \right)}^{R_n^n[2]} \\ & + \underbrace{c^{n-1} P(H_{\overline{1}} | X_1^n = x_1^n)}_{R_n^n[3]} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(a^{j-1} c P(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n) \right)}_{R_n^n[4]} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_n^n[1] &= \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \left(a^{n-j} P(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n) \right) \\ R_n^n[2] &= bP(H_1 | X_1^n = x_1^n)) \\ R_n^n[3] &= c^{n-1} P(H_{\overline{1}} | X_1^n = x_1^n) \\ R_n^n[4] &= \sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(a^{j-1} c P(H_{\bar{j}} | X_1^n = x_1^n) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_n^n[1]$ can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{n+1}^{n+1}[1] &= \sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(a^{(n+1)-j} P(H_j|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1})\right) \\
&= \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \left(a^{(n+1)-j} P(H_j|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1})\right) + aP(H_n|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\
&= \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \left(a^{n-j} P(H_j|X_1^{n} = x_1^{n})\right) af_1(x_{n+1}) + aP(H_n|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\
&= R_n^n[1] af_1(x_{n+1}) + aP(H_n|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

$R_n^n[2]$ can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{n+1}^{n+1}[2] &= bP(H_1|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\
&= \left(bP(H_1|X_1^{n} = x_1^{n})\right) f_0(x_{n+1}) \\
&= R_n^n[2] f_0(x_{n+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

$R_n^n[3]$ can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{n+1}^{n+1}[3] &= c^n P(H_{\overline{1}}|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\
&= \left(c^{n-1} P(H_{\overline{1}}|X_1^{n} = x_1^{n})\right) cf_1(x_{n+1}) \\
&= R_n^n[3] cf_1(x_{n+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

and $R_n^n[4]$ can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{n+1}^{n+1}[4] &= \sum_{j=2}^{n+1} \left(a^{j-1} cP(H_{\overline{j}}|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1})\right) \\
&= \sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(a^{j-1} cP(H_j|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1})\right) + a^n cP(H_{\overline{n+1}}|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\
&= \left(\sum_{j=2}^{n} \left(a^{j-1} cP(H_j|X_1^{n} = x_1^{n})\right)\right) f_0(x_{n+1}) + a^n cP(H_{\overline{n+1}}|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\
&= R_n^n[4] f_0(x_{n+1}) + a^n cP(H_{\overline{n+1}}|X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

In (13) $R_{k'}^n$ has Bayes risk

$$R_{k'}^n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(L_{k'j} P(H_j|X_1^n = x_i^n) + L_{k'\overline{j}} P(\overline{H_j}|X_1^n = x_1^n)\right),$$

where (5) is used along with the following costs associated with choosing hypothesis H_k, $1 \leq k < n$, given H_j or $\overline{H_j}$, respectively:

$$L_{kj} \equiv \begin{cases} b & \text{if } j = 1 \neq k \text{ or } j > k \\ a^{k-j} & \text{if } 2 \leq j < k \\ 0 & \text{if } j = k \ , \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

$$L_{k\overline{j}} \equiv \begin{cases} c^{k-1} & \text{if } j = 1 \\ a^{j-1}c^{n-k+1} & \text{if } 1 < j < k \\ a^{k-1}c^{n-j+1} & \text{if } j \geq k \ , \end{cases}$$

where a, b, and c are as defined before. Using the above costs,

$$\begin{aligned} R^n_{k'} = & \overbrace{\sum_{j=2}^{k'-1} \left(a^{k-j} P(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n)\right)}^{R^n_{k'}[1]} \\ & + \overbrace{\sum_{j=k'+1}^{n} \left(bP(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n)\right)}^{R^n_{k'}[2]} \\ & + \overbrace{bP(H_1 | X_1^n = x_1^n)}^{R^n_{k'}[3]} + \overbrace{c^{k'-1} P(H_{\overline{1}} | X_1^n = x_1^n)}^{R^n_{k'}[4]} \\ & + \overbrace{\sum_{j=2}^{k'-1} \left(a^{j-1} c^{n-k'+1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^n = x_1^n)\right)}^{R^n_{k'}[5]} \\ & + \underbrace{\sum_{j=k'}^{n} \left(c^{n-j+1} a^{k'-1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^n = x_1^n)\right)}_{R^n_{k'}[6]} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where

$$R^n_{k'}[1] = \sum_{j=2}^{k'-1} \left(a^{k-j} P(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n)\right) \tag{18}$$

$$R^n_{k'}[2] = \sum_{j=k'+1}^{n} \left(bP(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n)\right) \tag{19}$$

$$R^n_{k'}[3] = bP(H_1 | X_1^n = x_1^n) \tag{20}$$

$$R^n_{k'}[4] = c^{k'-1} P(H_{\overline{1}} | X_1^n = x_1^n) \tag{21}$$

$$R_{k'}^n[5] = \sum_{j=2}^{k'-1} \left(a^{j-1} c^{n-k'+1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^n = x_1^n) \right) \quad (22)$$

$$R_{k'}^n[6] = \sum_{j=k'}^{n} \left(c^{n-j+1} a^{k'-1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^n = x_1^n) \right). \quad (23)$$

where $R_{k'}^n[i],\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, 6$ can each be updated recursively. $R_{k'}^n[1]$ can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{k'}^{n+1}[1] &= \sum_{j=2}^{k'-1} \left(a^{k-j} P(H_j | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=2}^{k'-1} \left(a^{k-j} P(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n) \right) \right) f_1(x_{n+1}) \\ &= R_{k'}^n[1] f_1(x_{n+1}), \end{aligned}$$

$R_{k'}^n[2]$ can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{k'}^{n+1}[2] &= \sum_{j=k'+1}^{n+1} \left(bP(H_j | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=k'+1}^{n} \left(bP(H_j | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \right) + bP(H_{n+1} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=k'+1}^{n} (bP(H_j | X_1^n = x_1^n)) \right) f_1(x_{n+1}) + bP(H_{n+1} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\ &= R_{k'}^n[2] f_1(x_{n+1}) + bP(H_{n+1} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}), \end{aligned}$$

$R_{k'}^n[3]$ can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{k'}^{n+1}[3] &= bP(H_1 | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\ &= (bP(H_1 | X_1^n = x_1^n)) f_0(x_{n+1}) \\ &= R_{k'}^n f_0(x_{n+1}), \end{aligned}$$

$R_{k'}^n[4]$ can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{k'}^{n+1}[4] &= c^{k'-1} P(H_{\overline{1}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\ &= \left(c^{k'-1} P(H_{\overline{1}} | X_1^n = x_1^n) \right) f_1(x_{n+1}) \\ &= R_{k'}^n[4] f_1(x_{n+1}), \end{aligned}$$

$R^n_{k'}[5]$ can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned} R^{n+1}_{k'}[5] &= \sum_{j=2}^{k'-1} \left(a^{j-1} c^{(n+1)-k'+1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=2}^{k'-1} \left(a^{j-1} c^{n-k'+1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^{n} = x_1^{n}) \right) c f_0(x_{n+1}) \\ &= R^n_{k'}[5] c f_0(x_{n+1}), \end{aligned}$$

and $R^n_{k'}[6]$ can be updated recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned} R^{n+1}_{k'}[6] &= \sum_{j=k'}^{n+1} \left(c^{(n+1)-j+1} a^{k'-1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=k'}^{n} \left(c^{(n+1)-j+1} a^{k-1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \right) \right) + c a^{k'-1} P(H_{\overline{n+1}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=k'}^{n} \left(c^{n-j+1} a^{k-1} P(H_{\overline{j}} | X_1^{n} = x_1^{n}) \right) \right) c f_0(x_{n+1}) + c a^{k'-1} P(H_{\overline{n+1}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}) \\ &= R^n_{k'}[6] c f_0(x_{n+1}) + c a^{k'-1} P(H_{\overline{n+1}} | X_1^{n+1} = x_1^{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Due to symmetry in the above definitions, showing that R^n_1 and R^n_k may be calculated recursively is equivalent to showing that $R^n_{\overline{1}}$ and $R^n_{\overline{k}}$ may be calculated recursively, respectively. Thus, at any time n, the minimum-risk hypothesis among the $2n$ possible two-sided change scenarios can be recursively calculated. It is worth noting that while recusrive tracking of Bayes risk may be extendible to other cost structures, the one chosen above is meaningful across time.

IV. Cost Parameter Bounds and Tradeoffs

In Section III, a sequential two-sided change detector is formulated using Bayesian $(2n)$-ary hypothesis framework. Next, it is shown that cost parameter values may be determined to satisfy desirable properties. Generally, previous *one-sided tests* for change detection from known starting states such as those of CUSUM [1] and that of Shiryaev [3], the probability of a missed detection can easily be made to vanish. Rather than missed detection, average detection delay has therefore been used to assess change detector performance. For this two-sided problem, we adopt the additional notion of *incorrect detection* to indicate any event where the minimum-risk

hypothesis is $\overline{H_j}$, where $1 < j \leq n$, when H_k, where $1 \leq k \leq n$, is true, or vice versa. Note that no such incorrect detection can occur when $\overline{H_j}$ is the minimum risk hypothesis.

As will be discussed, once the initial state is established, the proposed two-sided change detector has the property of desirable one-sided test behavior [4]. This occurs when the effects of opposite-sided risks vanish, at which point the test effectively becomes one-sided over time.

A. Incorrect Detection

In the cost function, recall that $a > 1$ is the base for the exponential cost of delay. Note that cost increases in proportion to number of observations away from the true change time m. We establish bounds on parameter values to ensure convergence of correct-sided risks and divergence of incorrect-sided risks. Using Eqs. (5) and (6), and independence, under H_1 is given by

$$\mathbb{E}\left[P(H_j|X_1^n)\right] = \tag{24}$$
$$\begin{cases} \frac{(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}\mathbb{E}[f_0(X_i)|X_i\sim f_0])(\prod_{i=k}^{n}\mathbb{E}[f_0(X_i)|X_i\sim f_1])P(H_k)}{P(X_1^n)} & j=1, \\ (\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}\mathbb{E}\left[f_0(X_i)|X_i\sim f_0\right])(\prod_{i=k}^{j-1}\mathbb{E}\left[f_0(X_i)|X_i\sim f_1\right]) & \\ (\prod_{i=j}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[f_1(X_i)|X_i\sim f_1\right])P(H_1)/P(X_1^n) & 1<j\leq n \end{cases}$$

where we assume equal prior probabilities and $k < j$. For $k \geq j$, the roles of j and k in the products in the $j \neq 1$ case would be reversed. Employing (5) in (24), expected values of the posterior probabilities for $k < j \leq n$ are:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[P(H_j|X_1^n)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[P(H_1|X_1^n)\right] {d_1}^{n-j+1} \\ \mathbb{E}\left[P(\overline{H_j}|X_1^n)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[P(H_1|X_1^n)\right] d_0^{k-1}{d_1}^{j-k} \\ \mathbb{E}\left[P(\overline{H_1}|X_1^n)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[P(H_1|X_1^n)\right] d_0^{k-1}{d_1}^{n-k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

and for $n \geq k \geq j$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[P(H_j|X_1^n)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[P(H_1|X_1^n)\right] d_0^{k-j}{d_1}^{n-k+1} \\ \mathbb{E}\left[P(\overline{H_j}|X_1^n)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[P(H_1|X_1^n)\right] d_0^{j-1}{d_1}^{k-j} \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where the ratios of expected values,

$$d_0 \equiv \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[f_1(X_j)|X_j \sim f_0\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[f_0(X_j)|X_j \sim f_0\right]}, \quad d_1 \equiv \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[f_1(X_j)|X_j \sim f_1\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[f_0(X_j)|X_j \sim f_1\right]}. \tag{26}$$

From (7) and (17)-(26),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[R_k^n] = \\
&P(H_1|X_1^n = x_1^n)\times \\
&\Big[b + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^{k-1} a^{k-j} {d_0'}^{j-k} d_1^{n-k+1} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} b d_1^{n-j+1} + c^{k-1} {d_0'}^{1-k} d_1^{n-k+1} \\
&+ \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^{k-1} a^{j-1} c^{n-k+1} {d_0'}^{1-j} d_1^{k-j} + \sum_{j=k}^{n} a^{k-1} c^{n-j+1} {d_0'}^{1-k} d_1^{j-k}\Big]
\end{aligned}$$

where $d_0' \equiv 1/d_0$ is used to provide symmetry with the definition of d_1. From (8), the expected risks associated with the opposite-side tests can be similarly computed as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[R_{\overline{k}}^n] = \\
&P(H_1|X_1^n = x_1^n)\times \\
&\Big[c^{k-1} + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^{k-1} a^{j-1} c^{n-k+1} {d_0'}^{j-k} d_1^{n-k+1} + \sum_{j=k}^{n} c^{n-j+1} a^{k-1} d_1^{n-k+1} + b {d_0'}^{1-k} d_1^{n-k+1} \\
&+ \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^{k-1} a^{k-j} {d_0'}^{1-j} d_1^{k-j} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} b {d_0'}^{1-k} d_1^{j-k}\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Asymptotically, as $n \to \infty$, under correct detection, when k is fixed with $k << n$,

$$\mathbb{E}[R_k^n] \approx P(H_1|X_1^n = x_1^n)\left[O((d_1)^n) + O(c^n) + O(cd_0)^n)\right], \tag{27}$$

and under incorrect detection,

$$\mathbb{E}[R_{\overline{k}}^n] \approx P(H_1|X_1^n = x_1^n)\left[O((cd_1)^n) + O(d_1^n))\right]. \tag{28}$$

Clearly, as there are no parameter values for which (27) converges and (28) diverges, this asymptotic performance condition does not yield insight. On the other hand, consider the case where asymptotically, as $n \to \infty$, $k \approx n$,

$$\mathbb{E}[R_k^n] \approx P(H_1|X_1^n = x_1^n)(O((a{d_0'}^{-1})^n) + O((c{d_0'}^{-1})^n) + O((a{d_0'}^{-1}d_1)^n)), \tag{29}$$

which, for convergence, requires

$$a < d_0', c < d_0', \text{ and } a < d_0' {d_1}^{-1}. \tag{30}$$

For the opposite-sided risks,

$$\mathbb{E}[R^n_{\overline{k}}] \approx P(H_1|X_1^n = x_1^n) \left[O(c^n) + O(a^n) + O((acd_0'^{-1})^n) + O((d_0'^{-1})^n) + O((ad_0'^{-1}d_1)^n)\right], \tag{31}$$

which implies the following divergence conditions:

$$a > 1, c > 1, d_0' < 1, ac > d_0' \text{ and } a > d_0' d_1^{-1}. \tag{32}$$

To avoid incorrect detection for large k and n, we note that the last term is common to both (29) and (31) and so we ignore it as it does not affect the choice of the minimum risk hypothesis. The parameters need to satisfy the rest of the convergence conditions (30) and at least one of the remaining divergence conditions (32). This results in

$$1 < d_0', \ \max(a, c) < d_0', \text{ and } ac > d_0' \tag{33}$$

and establishes

Theorem 1. *Under conditions (33) and $0 < b < \infty$, the probability of incorrect detection of the proposed procedure (9) asymptotically converges to zero at an exponential rate as the number of observations gets large.*

Proof: Applying (30) to (27), at least one of the n expected risks corresponding to correct detection converge to a steady state. This means that the minimum Bayes risk of correct detection must be bounded. Let its value be denoted by $r_{\min} < \infty$. Consider the random variable $(r_{\min} - R^n_{\overline{p}})_+$, for any $1 \leq p \leq n$. Applying (32), $R^n_{\overline{p}}$ is a diverging incorrect detection hypothesis and $(\cdot)_+$ denotes $\max(\cdot, 0)$. Applying Markov's inequality,

$$P\left((r_{\min} - R^n_{\overline{p}})_+ > \epsilon\right) < \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[(r_{\min} - R^n_{\overline{p}})_+\right]}{\epsilon} \tag{34}$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. Since $\mathbb{E}[R^n_{\overline{p}}] \to \infty$, the expectation on the right hand side vanishes as $n \to \infty$ for any finite $r_{\min}$. As any positive probability on the left-hand side represents the probability that $R^n_{\overline{p}}$ is the minimum risk hypothesis, we see that the incorrect detection probability vanishes to zero. ■

Remark 1. *Opposite-sided risks will stay large when a change occurs, i.e., under H_k, where $k > 1$. In fact, larger parameters a and c cause opposite-sided risks to diverge more quickly, reducing the probability of incorrect detection and the proposed test converges more quickly to a one-sided test.*

Remark 2. *An interpretation of (27) can be made on initial transient behaviour. The time spent in an initial state where opposite-side risks are large enough to incur an incorrect detection decreases as a and c increase.*

Remark 3. *Interchanging the roles of f_0 and f_1 interchanges d_0' and d_1.*

Remark 4. *Letting $c = a$, we then may choose $\sqrt{d_0'} < a < d_0'$ as one example design.*

B. Delay and False Alarm

It is worth further investigating the correct-sided risks for finite n under the conditions of Theorem 1. From (9), when H_1 is true, convergence is no slower than that of R_1^n, which from (27), is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[R_1^n] = P(H_1|X_1^n = x_1^n) \times (d_1^{n+1} b \sum_{j=1}^{n} d_1^{-j} + a^{n+1} d_1^{-1} \sum_{j=2}^{n} (d_1/a)^j) \tag{35}$$

which approaches a steady-state risk value which depends on d_1, which is determined by the distance between PDFs f_0 and f_1. Clearly d_0 and $d_1 \to 1$ as $f_1 \to f_0$. Before reaching a steady state, the above average risk, and hence the delay, can be lowered by reducing the false alarm cost, b. Also from (27), average delay may be alternatively reduced by reducing the value of unit delay cost, a. However, too small a value of a can violate condition (32) and increase the probability of incorrect detection.

Interpreting Theorem 1, parameters a and c may be chosen to minimize start-up transient behaviour to limit the probability of incorrect detection. Unfortunately, from (27), increasing the values of a and c will also increase delay by increasing R_k^n. In essence, large a and c avoid incorrect detection at a cost of increased delay.

We see that increasing parameter b serves as an alternative mechanism to lower both probability of false alarm as well as probability of incorrect detection, by increasing the risk of alternative

hypotheses. We note that under the correct detection hypothesis, b is less sensitive to delay, that a and c, so the combination of a large b value with small enough values of a and c to satisfy Theorem 1 would enable a superior finite-sample performance tradeoff of error probabilities and delay.

V. Simulation Results and Conclusions

The classic example of detection of a change in mean of a Gaussian distribution is simulated to illustrate the proposed two-sided sequential test. Due to symmetry, the performance of the sequential two-sided change detector is equivalent in either direction. PDFs f_0 and f_1 are defined, respectively, as

$$f_0 = \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \text{ vs. } f_1 = \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$$

where μ represents the mean shift corresponding to the change in distribution observed and σ represents the variance of the Gaussian distribution. Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) SNR $\equiv \frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}$. From (26) we obtain $d_0 = d_1 = e^{\text{SNR}/4}$, and for SNR=3dB=1.99, we choose $a = c = 1.45$ to satisfy the conditions for Theorem 1.

It is first illustrated that the sequential two-sided change detector behaves as intended both before and after a change occurs. In Figure 1 the four minimum risks given in (9) are tracked over time, n, where a change in distribution occurs at $n = 100$. The behaviour of the risks in Figure 1 exhibit the characteristics described in previous sections: (i) both correct-sided risks quickly converge to a finite value under H_1, (ii) when the change occurs at $n = 100$, the risk corresponding to *correct change* drops to a relatively constant small value, while the risk corresponding to *no change* occurring diverges towards infinity, and (iii) opposite-sided risks diverge during the initial transient period and remain larger than the correct-sided risks after the transient period. Overall, it can be seen that the behaviour of the two-sided change detection scheme quickly approaches that of a one-sided change detector after a change occurs. The duration and likelihood of an error occurring during the transient period can be controlled through cost parameters a and c, as discussed in previous sections.



Fig. 1. Recursively tracked risks for the 4 hypotheses. In this Monte Carlo simulation, a change from f_0 to f_1 occurs at $n = 100$, SNR = 3 dB, $d_0' = d_1 \approx 1.65$. The parameter values were $a = c = 1.45$ and $b = 10000$.

The performance of the proposed sequential two-sided change detection scheme is evaluated next. Simulations were for a fixed change time of $n = 500$, and parameter values were chosen to satisfy: (1) parameters a and c are chosen to control the probability of incorrect detection according to Theorem 1, and (2) parameter b is chosen to achieve a probability of false alarm of 0.05. Average detection delay is obtained as a function of SNR. Based on Section IV, it is known that these average detection delays represent the minimum delay cost for that particular SNR given a maximum allowable probability of false alarm of 0.05. The initial state chosen in each simulation realization is f_0 or f_1 with equal probability. Figure 2 shows the performance of the sequential two-sided change detector alongside that of CUSUM, the optimal one-sided change detection algorithm assuming the initial state were known.

From Figure 2 it is clear that the sequential two-sided detection scheme has delay only slightly greater than that of the optimal one-sided change detector, CUSUM, whose threshold is chosen to give the same allowable probability of false alarm to within 95% statistical confidence. It must be noted that this performance comparison is unfair, being solutions to different problems: the sequential two-sided change detector identifies a change in state given a random initial state, whereas CUSUM identifies a change in state given a known initial state. Rather, the intention of



Fig. 2. Minimum average detection delay for a maximum probability of false alarm of 0.05.

this comparison is to illustrate the performance penalty in not knowing the initial state. From this example, it can be concluded that the unknown initial state adds less than 10% to the average delay at an SNR as low as -6dB.

In summary, this new approach is motivated by the fact that conventional approaches to change detection are one-sided and require a known initial state, and that creating a two-sided change detector from one-sided approaches has necessarily poor performance. Important features of the proposed approach are its efficient recursive structure (but not provided in detail here) as well as its ability to effectively trade off delay and error probabilities under suitable parameter choices motivated by asymptotic analysis.

REFERENCES

[1] E. S. Page, "Continuous inspection schemes," *Biometrika*, vol. 41, pp. 100–115, June 1954.

[2] G. Lorden, "Procedures for reacting to a change in distribution," *Ann. Statist.*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 1897–1908, 1971.

[3] A. N. Shiryaev, *Optimal Stopping Rules*. Springer, 1978.

[4] G. V. Moustakides, "Optimal stopping times for detecting changes in distributions," *Ann. Statist.*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1379–1387, 1986.

[5] H. V. Poor and O. Hadjiliadis, *Quickest Detection*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

[6] Q. Zhao and J. Ye, "Quickest Detection in Multiple On-Off Processes," *IEEE Trans. Signal Proc.*, vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 5994–6006, Dec. 2010.

[7] S. Zarrin and T. J. Lim, “Composite hypothesis testing for cooperative spectrum sensing in cognitive radio,” in *IEEE ICC*, 2009, pp. 1–5.

[8] J. K. Liang and S. Blostein, “Performance evaluation of multiband multi-sensor spectrum sensing systems,” in *IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2011, pp. 1002–1007.

[9] H. V. Poor, *An Introduction to Signal Detection and Estimation*. Springer-Verlag, 1994.